

RESPONSE

The Applicant's hereby respond to the issues raised by the Examiner in the subject office action.

I. Amendment of Claim 21

Claim 21 has been amended to properly claim dependency on Claim 20, rather than claim 1.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kolwalski (U.S. 4,769,052). Applicants respectfully dissent and argue against such finding on the belief that each and every element of the respective claims are not taught by Kolwalski.

Referring now to independent claim 1, the Applicant's will examine each claim element.

- **A filter wrap for a cylindrical filter:** The device detailed and claimed in Kolwalski is not a filter wrap for a cylindrical filter but a filter assembly generally comprising support housing and a flexible fabric filter that is overlaid over a stretching element that is then placed into the support, thus forming a complete filter apparatus. Contrast the Kolwalski structure with that of the instant invention in which is an external filter wrap that enshrouds a Contrast the Kolwalski structure with that of the instant invention in which is an external filter wrap that enshrouds and existing and complete cylindrical filter.

- **a tubular sheet having an interior side initially facing said filter when said sheet is wrapped on the filter, an exterior side and an edge defining a main opening to said interior for receiving said filter:** Again, the Kolwalski structure does not define a filter that subsequently has a fabric sheet (pre-filter) which surrounds it.

- **at least one strap having one end attached to said sheet near said edge and an accessible distal end wherein pulling said strap(s) everts said sheet as it pulled off of said**

filter wherein said debris residing on the exterior of said sheet is trapped within said sheet upon eversion of said sheet.: While the Kolwalski structure arguable has straps that are attached to a distal end of the sheet, pulling on such straps does not evert said sheet. The filter sheet of Kolwalski is never everted (i.e., turned inside-out upon itself). A portion of which, however, is reversed upon itself to form an inner and outer surface to double the filtering capacity (See Col. 4, lines 40-45). More importantly, when the filtering element of Kolwalski is removed from the support element (along the internal stretching element), the filtering element is pulled out as a whole and is not everted. In fact, it would seem that the filtering element/sheet would return to its original configuration through the weight of water and debris trapped inside of this element when the stretching element is removed. It must be emphasized that the disclosure of Kolwalski in no way teaches or suggests that the respective filter element will evert upon removal using the attached handles (See e.g., Col 6, lines 65-68 through Col. 7, lines 1-7). Also, any debris contained within Kolwalski element is retained within the element, not on the outside of the element, as is claimed in the instant application.

Again, the Applicants would maintain that the rejection of Claim 1 under Section 102 is not appropriate as each and every element and limitation thereof is not disclosed in the Kolwalski reference. As such, the Applicants would respectfully request that the refusal of Claim 1 be withdrawn. Further, as Claims 2-9 depend on an allowable base claim (as argued by the Applicants), the Section 102 refusal of these claims also should be withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 14, the Applicants would like to reiterate and specifically their remarks concerning Claim 1 in that Kolwalski does not discuss a wrap for an already in place filter and, particularly, a filter wrap that everts upon removal from the filter. Again, for these reasons, Applicants do not believe that each and every element of Claim 14 (and dependent claims 15-19 which depend on an allowable base claim, per the Applicant's arguments) is taught in Kolwalski. As such, Applicants would request withdrawal of the Section 102 refusal as it applies to Claims 15-19.

Claims 10-13 and 20-21 have been cancelled and thus withdrawn from prosecution.


Conclusion

Applicants have responded to the rejections contained in the subject Office Action. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to clarify any additional technical issues or informalities that would otherwise hold up issuance of a patent on this application.

It is not believed that any fees are due in connection with this amendment, but any required payments may be deducted, and any credits refunded, to Deposit Account No. 18-2284.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER RUDNICK
GRAY CARY US LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thomas W. Ryan', is written over a horizontal line.

Thomas W. Ryan
Reg. No. 43,072
Telephone: (312) 368-4058

Dated: July 27, 2005